



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/081,369	02/22/2002	Barrett E. Cole	H0002243	2959
128	7590	08/31/2004	EXAMINER	
HONEYWELL INTERNATIONAL INC. 101 COLUMBIA ROAD P O BOX 2245 MORRISTOWN, NJ 07962-2245			WILLE, DOUGLAS A	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2814	

DATE MAILED: 08/31/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/081,369	COLE ET AL.
	Examiner Douglas A Wille	Art Unit 2814

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2004.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-24 and 42 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) 42 is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-17 and 19-24 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 18 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1 – 24 and 42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The amended claims show a bandpass filter that passes a spectrum this wider than can be detected by a single detector. First, the specification shows the case where the output of the filter is viewed by more than one detector as a matter of choice and does not support the claimed feature. Second, it is well known in the art that a bolometer, which is shown by the primary reference has a basically unlimited detection range whereas the Fabry-Perot filter has a range that is limited to the free spectral range. Thus the limitation is not supported by the specification and is not physical.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1 – 4, 9 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of Tokuda et al.
5. With respect to claims 1 and 47, Cole et al. show (see cover Figure and column 2, line 9 et seq.) a detector for spectroscopic detection (see abstract) with detectors 14 and tunable Fabry-

Perot filter 22, 20. Tokuda et al. show a detector (see Figure 12 and column 3, line 15) with stacked detectors with different wavelength sensitivity (see Figure 11) which has enhanced wavelength selectivity (column 2, line 10). It would have been obvious to use the Tokuda et al. detector in the Cole et al. device to improve the wavelength sensitivity. Note that what is passed by the Fabry-Perot is examined.

6. With respect to claim 2, the detectors are stacked.
7. With respect to claim 3, the Cole et al. Fabry-Perot is tunable.
8. With respect to claim 4, the filter is a Fabry-Perot.
9. With respect to claim 9, Cole et al. shows the substrate could be sapphire or glass (column 2, line 24).
10. Claims 5 - 8 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of Tokuda et al. and further in view of Hier et al. and Koslowski et al.
11. With respect to claims 5 and 6 Cole et al. shows that the device could operate in the visible region (column 2, line 38) Hier et al. show that a programmable multiwavelength detector array operating in the visible and UV (see Figures 2 and 4 and column 2, line 60) could be GaN/AlGaN and could be stacked vertically (column 3, line 67). It would have been obvious to include the materials shown by Hier et al. in the Cole et al. device to provide the visible wavelength and to extend the operating region to shorter wavelengths. Koslowski. et al. show that UV imagers could be formed with AlGaN, GaN and InGaN (table 1, column 5). It would have been obvious to include all the materials shown by Koslowski et al. to provide the widest possible wavelength range to increase the utility of the device.

12. With respect to claims 7 and 8, Koslowski et al. show that the claimed wavelengths can be reached with the materials shown.

13. With respect to claim 12, Hier et al. show (Figure 2 and column 2, line 61) a stacked detector where light enters through the substrate. It would have been obvious to modify the basic device to include light entering through the substrate since all contacts and contact wires will be directed away from the detectors and will not obscure them.

14. Claims 10, 11, 13 – 17, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of Tokuda et al. and Yokoi.

15. With respect to claims 10, 11, 17 and 23, Cole et al. shows the device can be used to evaluate external sources (see Figure 18 and column 7, line 55). Yokoi shows (see column 1, line 10) that living tissues and cells can be evaluated by using fluorescence spectroscopy using a laser. It would have been obvious to use the Cole et al. device for the application shown by Yokoi to expand its capabilities.

16. With respect to claim 13, as noted by Applicant, charge detectors are standard devices and their use would be obvious.

17. With respect to claims 14 and 15, Cole shows a Fabry-Perot substrate, and a detector substrate. It would be obvious to include the charge detector on another substrate since it is an electronic device and not an optical device and the use of circuitry to operate the device would also be obvious.

18. With respect to claim 16, Cole et al. show two substrates and the detector of Tokuda et al. would be on the second substrate.

19. With respect to claim 19, the Cole et al. filter is a Fabry-Perot.

20. With respect to claim 24, Cole et al. show that both glass and sapphire substrates can be used with the sapphire being appropriate for the growth of GaN compounds and the use of glass for the filter is a function of the desired transmission and the cost of the substrate and the choice is a design alternative.

21. Claims 20- 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cole et al. in view of Tokuda et al. and Yokoi and further in view of Hier et al. and Koslowski et al.

22. With respect to claims 20 and 21, Cole et al. shows that the device could operate in the visible region (column 2, line 38) Hier et al. shows that a programmable multiwavelength detector array operating in the visible and UV (see Figures 2 and 4 and column 2, line 60) could be GaN/AlGaN and could be stacked vertically (column 3, line 67). It would have been obvious to include the materials shown by Hier et al. in the Cole et al. device to provide the visible wavelength and to extend the operating region to shorter wavelengths. Koslowski. et al. show that UV imagers could be formed with AlGaN, GaN and InGaN (table 1, column 5). It would have been obvious to include all the materials shown by Koslowski et al. to provide the widest possible wavelength range to increase the utility of the device.

23. With respect to claim 22, Koslowski et al. show that the claimed wavelengths can be reached with the materials shown.

Allowable Subject Matter

24. Claim 18 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

25. Claim 42 is allowed.

26. Cole et al. show a sealing support 30 and Kozlowski et al. show a bump bond but it would not be obvious to use the bump bond in place of the Cole et al. support since it does not provide a complete seal.

Response to Arguments

27. Applicant's arguments filed 7/6/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

28. Applicant states that the radiation passed by the bandpass filter is too wide to be detected by a single detector but see the discussion in the 112 rejection above and note that Cole et al. shows the use of a microbolometer as a detector. It appears that Applicant has elected to use more than one detector and this is shown by the references quoted. Applicant also states that the detectors detect a larger spectrum than can be detected by a single detector but note that, first this is not true for a bolometer and second, the detectors of Tokuda et al., cover a wider range cumulatively than a single detector.

Conclusion

29. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Douglas A Wille whose telephone number is (571) 272-1721. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (6:15-2:45).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Wael Fahmy can be reached on (571) 272-1705. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9306 for regular communications and (703) 872-9306 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Douglas A. Wille
Primary Examiner

August 31, 2004